



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/047,020	01/15/2002	William Kress Bodin	AUS920010777US1	5700

34533 7590 04/04/2006

INTERNATIONAL CORP (BLF)
c/o BIGGERS & OHANIAN, LLP
P.O. BOX 1469
AUSTIN, TX 78767-1469

EXAMINER

LIN, KELVIN Y

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2142

DATE MAILED: 04/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/047,020	Applicant(s) BODIN ET AL.	
	Examiner Kelvin Lin	Art Unit 2142	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Detailed Action

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15 have been considered but they are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
2. Applicant argues that Maekawa does not disclose providing at least two collaborative devices and each collaborative device comprising a client device and an embedded Java server.

The Office respectfully disagrees.

In Fig. 17, Maekawa discloses to provide the elements 3a-3n for serving at least two collaborative devices and each collaborative comprising a client devices as local serve with JavaVM (31a), which is an embedded Java Server. Moreover, in col.9, l.49-62, Maekawa discloses the air conditioner control service as one of the device to be implemented by using his method.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1,2, 4, 6, 7, 9,11,12, and14 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maekawa et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6848101) in view of Moyer

et al., (US PG Pub. No. 20020103898) and further in view of Elson et al., (US PG Pub. No. 20030014521)

2. Regarding claim 1, Maekawa teaches a method of control of collaborative devices, the method comprising the steps of:

- providing at least two collaborative devices (Maekawa, col.13, l.25-40), wherein each collaborative device comprises a client device and an embedded Java server (Maekawa, in Fig. 17, Maekawa discloses to provide the elements 3a-3n for serving at least two collaborative devices and each collaborative comprising a client devices as local serve with JavaVM (31a), which is an embedded Java Server. Moreover, in col.9, l.49-62, Maekawa discloses the air conditioner control service as one of the device to be implemented by using his method.);

Although Maekawa discloses the collaborative devices with Java server, Maekawa does not specifically disclose the registry service.

However, Moyer discloses the following limitations:

- providing a registry service to which the collaborative devices are coupled for data communications (Moyer, [0019], a registrar server that accepts register request. It keeps a list of registered addresses for communication between the requester (remote client) and devices (home appliance));

It would have been obvious to use the registry service of Moyer in the server and devices of Maekawa. Because both structures are implementing under OSGI, the register service for communication between remote client and home appliance provides the communication media for a more reliable communication system.

The motivation for Maekawa to incorporate with Moyer's register service is to enhance the security capability. (Moyer, [0024]).

- providing at least one registry table (Moyer, [0019], a list of registered address functions as a registry entry table), wherein the registry table further comprises registry records, wherein the registry records comprise registry records representing capabilities of collaborative devices, wherein the registry records representing capabilities of collaborative devices further comprise data elements describing, for each collaborative device, capabilities, tertiary relationships, and network connectivity (Moyer, [0348], fig. 12, Moyer discloses the processing of the User Agent (UA), which including the capability of control/share the home appliance in terms of model, functionality, and network connectivity);

Although Maekawa, and Moyer disclose the collaborative devices with Java server, the registry service, they do not specifically disclose the service bundle of OSGI.

However, Elson discloses the following limitations:

- providing a service bundle of OSGI-compliant Java servlets comprising at least one predetermined algorithm for controlling the collaborative devices (Elson, [0091], [0092], [0094], Fig.7, Elson discloses three different service bundle: application bundles, core service bundles, and management bundles. The application service bundle access management bundle, In turn, the management bundle access device and network resource via the device driver interface the are pre-determined parameter via the POSIX device file drivers. Moreover, the management and registry bundle exploits the Java 2 security framework to prevent Application Service Bundles . Finally, the open, standard management and registry bundle access system resources via the device driver interface, which are pre-determined procedures (algorithm));

It would have been obvious to use the OSGI service bundle of Elson in the server and devices of Maekawa. Because both structures are implementing under OSGI, bundle service and configuration may similarly be applied to distributed network within homes or office/industrial setting (Elson, [0225]).

The motivation for Maekawa to incorporate with Elson's OSGI bundle service is to enhance the security capability. (Elson, [0227]).

- controlling the collaborative devices in accordance with the predetermined algorithm (Elson, [0225]).

3. Regarding claim 2, Maekawa further discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the predetermined algorithm is dedicated to a particular tertiary relationship, and the predetermined algorithm comprises the further steps of:

- finding a registry record bearing a set point for the particular tertiary relationship (Maekawa, col.6, l.32-34, fig.2, and fig.10, in which it detects the event and records, the tertiary relationship among the temperature, wind velocity and air condition control) ;
- reading a sensor value of the particular tertiary relationship; comparing the set point and the sensor value, wherein the comparing produces a comparison result (Maekawa, col.6, l.35-41);
- finding, in dependence upon the comparison, a registry record having an identified capability appropriate to the comparison result for the particular tertiary relationship (Maekawa, col.6,l.52-55);
- effecting the capability identified in found registry record (Maekawa, col.6,l.52-59).

4. Regarding claim 4, Maekawa further discloses the method of claim 2 wherein reading a sensor value further comprises the steps of:

- finding a registry record for a sensor for the particular tertiary relationship (Maekawa, col.6,l.35-55, fig.9, in which the equipment corresponds to sensor).
- effecting the capability identified in the found registry record for the sensor (Maekawa, col.6,l.52-59).

5. Regarding claim 6, claiming a system for control of collaborative devices, has similar limitations as claim 1. Therefore, claim 6 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1.
6. Regarding claim 7, has similar limitations as claim 2. Therefore, claim 7 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 2.
7. Regarding claim 9, has similar limitations as claim 4. Therefore, claim 9 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 4.
8. Regarding claim 11, claiming for a computer program product for control of collaborative devices, has similar limitations as claim 1. Therefore, claim 11 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1.
9. Regarding claim 12, claiming for means plus function, has similar limitations as claim 2. Therefore, claim 7 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 2.
10. Regarding claim 14, claiming for means plus function, has similar limitations as claim 4. Therefore, claim 14 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 4.
11. Claims 3, 5, 8, 10, 13, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maekawa in view of Cheng et al., (US PG Pub No. 2001/0032273).

Although Maekawa teaches a method of control of collaborative devices predetermined algorithm, and XML. Maekawa fails to explicitly teach the

usage of HTTP and URL.

However, regarding claim 3, Cheng further discloses the method of claim 2 wherein effecting the capability identified in the found registry record includes requesting, by use of an HTTP request, a URL identified in the found registry record as a network connectivity (Cheng, [0036], I.1-18, [0038], I.1-9, in which the registry service to get the information using URL locator, and HTTP protocol for information request).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to include the teaching of Cheng for information request and link connectivity to registry service under OSGI.

The motivation for Maekawa to combine with Cheng's user support this system, would be collaborated with the client, interprets the user request and presents to the client information necessary to respond the request will be invoked for a server to access a client information over the network (Cheng , [0040], 1-8).

12. Regarding claim 5, Cheng further discloses the method of claim 4 wherein effecting the capability identified in the found registry record for the sensor includes requesting by use of an HTTP request, a URL identified in the found registry record for the sensor (Cheng, [0033], in which the architecture of the client corresponds to the sensor for the information request and retrieval).
13. Regarding claims 8, and 10 have similar limitations as claims 3, and 5.
Therefore, claims 8, and 10 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the

rejection of claims 3, and 5.

14. Regarding claims 13, and 15 have similar limitations as claims 3, and 5.

Therefore, claims 13, and 15 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 3, and 5.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kelvin Lin whose telephone number is 571-272-3898. The examiner can normally be reached on Flexible 4/9/5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on 571-272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

10/12/05
KYL



**ANDREW CALDWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**